DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 228 UD 016 616

AUTHOR Wohl, Seth F.
TITLE Staff Role Expectations: A Study of Alternative High Schools--1975. Research Report. Cooperative Research City Tax Levy Program.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE Jun 76
NOTE 44p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Alternative Schools; Comparative Analysis; Demography; High Schools; *Principals; *Role Perception; *Secondary School Teachers; Self Concept; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Role; Traditional Schools; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This study explores teacher and principal role expectations in conventional versus alternative secondary school settings. A 59-item "Role Expectations Instrument" was to give to 472 teachers in 11 conventional high schools, each having a mini-school associated with it, and in five independent alternative high schools. In addition, 11 principals of conventional high schools and five directors of independent alternative high schools completed a related questionnaire. The independent alternative schools had the youngest and most inexperienced staff with the least advanced academic educational credits. Mini-school staffs, on the other hand, greatly resembled the high school faculty group from which they had been derived. In conclusion, independent alternative school staffs, both attitudinally and demographically, perceived themselves very differently from mini-school alternative staffs who had self-selected themselves from their older conventional high school parental organizations. On many dimensions, mini-school faculties showed greater positivity and greater statistically significant differences from regular high school staffs than did their independent alternative colleagues. (Author/JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED132228

RESEARCH REPORT

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Cooperative Research
City Tax Levy
Program

STAFF ROLE EXPECTATIONS: A STUDY OF ALTERNATIVE HIGH SCHOOLS --- 1 9 7 5

Prepared by
Seth F. Wohl

June 1976

A second year Final Report component of the New York City Public School District's Alternative Education Program, supported by City of New York Tax Levy funding, and continuing under supervision of the Office of the Chancellor for School Year 1974-1975.

UD016616

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, New York 11201

A C K N O W L E D G M E N T

Printing of this report was delayed until June 1976 pending completion of the doctoral dissertation: A Comparative Study of Teacher and Principal Role Expectations in Regular and Alternative Secondary Schools, by Sidney Wenokor, Teachers College, Columbia University, Department of Curriculum and Teaching (May 1976). The dissertation and this brief report are among the output products resulting from the cooperative research function of the Office of Educational Evaluation.

Grateful appreciation is expressed to Dr. Sidney Wenokor of Francis Lewis H. S. Mini-School, Borough of Queens, for developing the instrumentation and carrying out the major research for this report, under the general supervision of the Department of Curriculum & Teaching at Teachers College, Columbia University, Associate Professor Ann Lieberman, Project Advisor, and the Office of Educational Evaluation of the Board of Education, City of New York, Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director.

Dr. Wenokor was recommended to the Office of Educational Evaluation, because of its continuing key role in the evaluation: Independent Alternative Schools from 1974, performed by the author of this report, and acting under a request from the Chancellor of the New York City Public School District.

The O. E. E. also wishes to thank the following directors of Alternative Independent High Schools of the Board of Education of the City of New York for making available time of their staff members in participating in this study:

Harold Genkin	Pacific Alternative H. S., Brooklyn
Frederick J. Koury	City-As-School
Howard Schnell	P. M. High School, Brooklyn
James Murphy	Lower East Side Prep., Manhattan
Marc Bassin	Satellite Academies, Manhattan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Acknowledgment		i
List of Tables		iii
Project Abstract		iv
CHAPTERS		
I	PURPOSE & GENERAL DESCRIPTION	1
II	PROCEDURES USED & INSTRUMENTATION	3
	Instrumentation	3
	Target Population and Sites	4
	Data Analyses	4
III	FINDINGS OF THE ROLE EXPECTATIONS STUDY	7
	Demographic Analysis	7
	Statistical Analyses of Major Dimensions	9
	Interview Data - Teachers and Principals of Alternative High Schools	18
IV	SUMMARY, CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATION	21
	Summary to Role Expectations Study	21
	Conclusion to Role Expectations Study	23
	Recommendation	23
APPENDICES		
A	THE WENOKOR INSTRUMENT (1975)	24
B	HIGH SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONS IN THE STAFF ROLE EXPECTATIONS STUDY	34

* * *

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Demographic Data by Percentages of Teaching Staffs in each Category	8
2.	Statistical Significance of Differences Between Alternative and Conventional High Schools on Major Dimensions as Measured by the Wenokor Role Expectations Instrument	10
3.	Statistical Significance of Differences Between Alternative and Conventional High Schools on Subset 5 of Wenokor's Role Expectations Instrument -- Teachers' Role Expectations	12
4.	Statistical Significance of Differences Between Alternative and Conventional High Schools on Subset 9 of S. Wenokor's Role Expectations Instrument -- Teachers' Aspirations	14
5.	Teachers' Perception of Principal's Evaluation Criteria By Percentage (%) Comparisons	17
6.	Characteristics of the Alternative H. S. Teacher	18
7.	Role Expectations for the Alternative H. S. Principal	19

* * *

STAFF ROLE EXPECTATIONS

P R O J E C T A B S T R A C T

An experience-based compendium attitudinal instrument in the field of educational sociology made of 10 subscales was constructed to assess role expectation differences between faculties in two types of alternative high schools and conventional high schools as controls in answer to the question:

"DO TEACHERS IN DIFFERENT KINDS OF SCHOOL SETTINGS DIFFER IN ATTITUDE AND IN PERCEPTION?"

The research produced positive answers to the above question by use of two types of computer program formulations: (1) an analysis of variance using "F"-tests of significance among both types of alternative faculties and conventional faculties combined for each subscale, and (2) multiple analyses by twos (three in number) between each type of faculty on each subscale using uncorrelated "t"-tests of significance.

Faculty role expectations varied widely, it was found in this highly complex study. Generally, school-within-school (mini-school) faculties exceeded their younger, less experienced Independent Alternative school colleagues in degree of positivity on professional-vs.-bureaucratic, teacher role expectation, and faculty aspiration subscales.

The need for detailed further clarification/validation studies on role expectation subscales with all that this implies for improved faculty performance and the benefit to instructional programs in alternative education models has been clearly indicated.

sfw

STAFF ROLE EXPECTATIONS:
A STUDY OF ALTERNATIVE HIGH SCHOOLS
1975

Chapter I
PURPOSE & GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The cooperative research function of the Office of Educational Evaluation was implemented in March 1975 to initiate a major spring study whose purpose was TO EXPLORE TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL ROLE EXPECTATIONS IN CONVENTIONAL VERSUS ALTERNATIVE SECONDARY SCHOOL SETTINGS. Stated most simply as a researchable question: Do teachers in different kinds of school settings differ in attitude and in perception? The study falls within the broad category or descriptor of educational sociology, and was designed to survey possible differences in the attitudes, perceptions and expectations among faculties in the several types of schools selected. Utilizing theoretical concepts from role theory and organizational theory, including role conflict, role consensus, dimensionality of school organization, and problems in cognitive dissonance, the study was an exploratory analysis rather than the testing of hypotheses as indicated by its author (Wenokor, 1975).[1]

This research report was completed as a spin-off from the (unpublished) Final Evaluation Report: Independent Alternative Schools (July 1975), Office of Educational Evaluation by the writer of this report, and constitutes a special substudy, first of its kind known in the New York City School District in role expectations for alternative school faculties in the field of educational sociology,

---

[1] Wenokor, Sidney. A Comparative Study of Teacher and Principal Role Expectations in Regular and Alternative Secondary Schools.
A Dissertation Proposal.
New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, Dep't. of Curriculum and Teaching. March, 1975. p. 9.

under general continuing supervision of the Office of the Chancellor (in its request for continuing evaluation of alternative education) as performed by the Office of Educational Evaluation operating under city tax levy funding. Costs of computer analysis services was donated by the developer of the innovative survey instrument used in this research study.

* * *

Chapter II

PROCEDURES USED & INSTRUMENTATION

Instrumentation

The methodology involved the design of a 59-item Role Expectations Instrument using a 5-value scale similar to a Likert scale on most items, and referred to as the "Wenokor Instrument," 1975 (see Appendix A). It was developed as a 10-subscale anthology or compendium of components by its author with several stages of editing assistance provided by the Office of Educational Evaluation in this study, as modified from a series of source instruments designed to measure aspects of role behavior and organizational models by Corwin ca. 1960; Lortie 1969; Samuels 1966; Gross et al 1958; and Robinson 1966. As shown in summary form at the beginning of the "Wenokor Instrument" in Appendix A, these sources were incorporated into one instrument as ten (10) subsections, measuring:

Subset Number	Aspect Measured
1.	Professional - Bureacratic orientation of staff.
2.	Task orientation (organizational or instructional).
3.	Teacher's perception of the Principal's (Director's) evaluative criteria.
4.	Occupational satistfactions by means of internal or external criteria.
5.	Teachers role expectations.
6.	Teacher's perception of the school's organizational characteristics.
7.	Degree of job satisfaction.
8.	Attitude toward supervision.
9.	Degree of aspiration toward professional responsibility and job recognition.
10.	Attitude toward teaching as career.

In addition, basic demographic data on teachers was requested, and added to the end of the questionnaire.

Target Population and Sites

The study involved 472 teachers in eleven (11) conventional high schools (Reg HS), having each a mini-school (school-within-a-school or S-W-S) associated with it thus subtotalling twenty-two (22) organizations, and in five (5) Independent Alternative High Schools (IA) for a total of twenty-seven (27) school site organizations. The faculty breakdown was as follows:

		Principal or Director
11 conventional high schools	- 358 teachers	11
11 mini-school alternatives (S-W-S)	- 52 teachers	(as above)
5 Independent Alternative H. S.	- 62 teachers	5
27 sites TOTAL	472 teachers	16 Prin. or Dir.

In addition, 11 principals of conventional H. S. and 5 Directors of Independent Alternative H. S. completed a related questionnaire to the one administered the teachers, and were interviewed in depth by the author. The schools have been coded for computer analysis and combined by category to protect anonymity of source differences. The names of these alternative schools, mini-schools and their parent regular high schools as comparison models have been listed in Appendix B without their code numbers.

Data Analyses

The data as received from the above listed target population faculties was tallied and key punched onto data processing cards. The computer analysis involved two principal programing formulations as well as several supplemental studies:

1. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) program testing each subsection or scale of items (and also testing separately each item within each scale) for statistically significant differences in responses of teachers as between conventional, mini-school and Independent Alternative high school faculties.

The output measure was the "F" statistic or variance ratio.

2. Since each ANOVA's output measure -- the "F" statistic, did not distinguish whether the source of possible significance was between conventional high school and one of the kinds of alternative high school projects or between the two kinds of alternative high schools studied, a separate series of programs was taken, using the uncorrelated "t" test for comparing group means as subanalyses from each ANOVA printout. Thus the possible occurence of statistical significance was pinpointed as to source, as shown in certain of the tables below in Chapter III.

3. A set of demographic data printouts on principal characteristics of the three groups of faculty members was completed by computer showing differences among faculties among the different types of school organizations by percentages along parameters of sex, age, status, educational background and years of service. Additionally, Chi Square analyses were planned to indicate which of the demographic variables might be significant. These appear in the dissertation, as they were performed subsequent to the Spring 1975 work reported here.[1]

4. A series of intercorrelation studies showing the interaction of selected subsections of the study and of selected items both within and between subsections (or scales), and according to types of school organizations using Pearson's "r" coefficient of correlation was discontinued. While of potential value to detailed study of items for the dissertation, this series of intercorrelations does not form a part of this report.

5. An analysis of the questionnaires completed by principals or directors and correlate in-depth interviews has been completed by conventional (non-computerized) means. The results along with a copy of the Principal's (Director's) Questionnaire

---

[1] Wenokor, Sidney. A Comparative Study of Teacher and Principal Role Expectations in Regular and Alternative Secondary Schools. Ed. D. Dissertation. New York: Teachers College, Columbia Univ., Dep't. of Curriculum and Teaching. May 1976.

appear in detail in the dissertation. The principal's (director's) instrument does not appear in the appendix of this report, but the results of the in depth interviews has been briefly summarized in tabular form for Chapter III -- "Findings."

Summarizing the five preceding paragraphs of the data analyses: paragraphs one and two constitute the two main programing formulations -- the analysis of variance program using the "F" statistic, and the within scale (subset) uncorrelated "t" test sets of analyses between the three types of schools involved in the study (Reg. H.S., S-W-S, and I. A.). Paragraphs three and four refer to the supplemental studies, only a small part of which is included in this report (the demographic study), and paragraph five refers to the in-depth interview analysis by conventional means.

* * *

Chapter III

FINDINGS OF THE ROLE EXPECTATIONS STUDY

Demographic Analysis

Table 1 presents the demographic data by percent of total group in each category of school organization. It clearly shows that the Independent Alternative High School faculties had by far the youngest staffs with many more single persons and far fewer years of teaching experience or years in the current school organization. They also had over four (4) times the percent of teachers with only a baccalaureate degree and far fewer faculty with advanced education credits. The conventional high school faculties together with their mini-school staffs as self-selected faculty subgroups as schools-within-school staff organizations did not differ greatly from each other in demographic data, but did differ tremendously overall from the Independent Alternative High Schools.

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 1
(see page 8)

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 1

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

by Percentages of Teaching Staffs in each Category

Dimensions		Conventional H. S. (n = 341)	Mini-School Alternatives (n = 57)	Independent Alternative H.S. (n = 61)
SEX:	Male	52.5	57.9	52.5
	Female	47.5	42.1	47.5
AGE:	21 - 30	26.8	30.4	55.7
	31 - 40	24.2	28.6	29.5
	41 - 50	28.6	30.4	11.5
	51 - 60	17.1	10.7	1.6
	61+-	3.2		1.6
MARITAL STATUS:	Single	25.7	28.1	44.3
	Married	68.9	66.7	50.8
	Other	5.3	5.3	4.9
NO. OF YEARS IN TEACHING:	1 yr.	1.8	1.8	10.2
	2 yrs.	3.3	5.3	18.6
	3 - 5 yrs.	13.6	12.3	28.8
	6 - 10 yrs.	28.3	38.6	23.7
	11 - 20 yrs.	39.6	35.0	16.9
	21 + yrs.	13.4	7.0	1.8
NO. OF YEARS IN THIS SCHOOL:	1 yr.	12.8	8.8	49.2
	2 yrs.	9.5	8.8	25.4
	3 - 5 yrs.	18.5	17.5	23.6
	6 - 10 yrs.	33.3	42.1	1.8
	11 - 20 yrs.	24.4	22.8	
	21 + yrs.	1.5		
AMOUNT OF EDUCATION:	B.A.	11.6	5.3	45.0
	B.A. + 30	22.9	38.6	21.7
	B.A. + 60	14.3	17.5	6.7
	B.A. +>60+	51.2	38.6	26.7

Statistical Analyses of Major Dimensions

Table 2 displays seven (7) subsets or item series from the questionnaire together with the results of their statistical analyses for significance of differences in the strength of responses obtained between the three different categories of school organization. In computer terminology, each subset or item series is referred to as a "Scale." Subset (or Scale) #1 shows the analysis from the combined 10-items dealing with Professional-vs.-Bureaucratic Orientation of Staffs.

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 2
(See page 10)

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 2 shows statistically significant differences in the "F" test of the Analysis of Variance among the three (3) school categories for five (5) of the seven (7) item clusters or scales, totalling 48 items:

Professional vs. bureaucratic orientation of staff
Task orientation
Occupational expectations
How school organizational features are perceived
Job satisfaction
Reaction to supervision, and
teaching as career;

twenty-five (25) of which items discriminated at the one percent (1%) level of significance.

Detailed further analysis of these item clusters in detailed tests of significance of differences among uncorrelated group means showed greater significance of differences between the group means of regular city academic high schools and their own mini-school alternatives than between these same conventional high schools and the Independent Alternative High Schools targeted for this study. For example, in the subset cluster on Professional vs. Bureaucratic Orientation of Staff, and in the subset on Degree of Job Satisfaction (Item #46), mini-school

Table 2

STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ALTERNATIVE AND CONVENTIONAL HIGH SCHOOLS ON MAJOR DIMENSIONS AS MEASURED BY THE WENOKOR ROLE EXPECTATIONS INSTRUMENT

Subset (Items)	Dimension	3 Sch. Cat.	Group Mean Response	Anal. of Variance All 3 School Categories Combined F-Value	Signif.	t - Tests of Uncorrelated Group Means Conventional vs.Mini-Sch. t	Sig.	Conventional vs.Indep.Alt. t	Sig.	Mini-Schools vs.Indep.Alt t	Sig.
Scale #1 (1-10)	Profess-Bureacrat. Orientation of Staff	Conv.	2.6075	9.2911	.01	4.2536	.01	0.0522	nsd.	3.6830	.01
		Mini.	2.3225								
		Indep.	2.6054								
Scale #2 (11-18)	Task Orientation (Organizational or Teaching)	Conv.	2.5241	1.3137	nsd.	1.5830	nsd.	0.1468	nsd.	1.4408	nsd.
		Mini.	2.4362								
		Indep.	2.5318								
Scale #4 (25-32)	Occupational Expect. (Internal or External Crit.)	Conv.	2.7840	6.7058	.01	3.4137	.01	2.0646	.05	0.9525	nsd.
		Mini.	2.5886								
		Indep.	2.6696								
Scale #6 (40-45)	Tchr's Perception of School's Org. Characteristics	Conv.	2.4450	42.3828	.01	8.8587	.001	2.7506	.01	5.3191	.001
		Mini.	1.8293								
		Indep.	2.2497								
Scale #7 (Item 46)	Degree of Job Satisfaction	Conv.	1.8989	6.3992	.01	3.6567	.01	0.8060	nsd.	2.1299	.05
		Mini.	1.1423								
		Indep.	1.8000								
Scale #8 (Item 47)	Reaction to Supervision	Conv.	1.8596	4.2375	.05	0.5062	nsd.	2.9313	.01	1.7421	nsd.
		Mini.	1.8039								
		Indep.	1.5536								
Scale#10 (56-59)	Teaching as a Career	Conv.	2.1247	2.2400	nsd.	0.3058	nsd.	2.0019	.05	1.6556	nsd.
		Mini.	2.0994								
		Indep.	2.2858								

NOTES:

Code:
Conv. = Conventional HS
Mini. = Mini-Sch. Altern.
Indep.= Independ. Altern.HS

Sample Sizes (No. of Cases)

Conv.	349-358
Mini.	51- 52
Indep.	56- 62
Total	456-472

Tabular Values of Levels of Signif.:
F >.05 = 3.02
F >.01 = 4.66
nsd = no signif. diff.

Tabular Values of Levels of Significance:
t >.05 = 1.960
t >.01 = 2.576
nsd = no significant difference, statistically speaking.

Interpretation of Group Mean Scale Values: Most values between 2.0+ and 3.0 on a 5-point scale represent more positivity as values decrease toward 2.0 or lower, and less positivity as values increase toward 3.0 (the point of neutrality). Group mean values below 2.0, such as 1.8888 are very highly positive; and, group mean values higher than 3.0, such as 3.2500 are representative of negative values.

alternative groups of teachers on both subsets showed significantly higher degree of positivity than either conventional or Independent Alternative high school teacher groups which did not significantly distinguish from each other. This finding is consonant with indications shown in selected interviews with alternative high school teachers, where, in the case of teachers at Independent Alternative schools, they had agreed to accept their positions more out of need at a time of few available teaching jobs; whereas, among mini-school faculties, members of established conventional high school staffs self-selected themselves, more to provide the alternative programs out of a sense of commitment to students who were not making it in the regular programs.

Table 3 analyzed separately each of the 7 items on the subset dealing with teachers' sense of obligations, because the item cluster taken as a whole was not generalizable into a single overall dimension. Rather some items dealt with teacher promotion of student output -- as cognitive vs. affective components; others into student power; still others into teacher expectation of cooperation with their colleagues, or of work with the community.

- - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 3
(See page 12)

- - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 3

STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ALTERNATIVE AND CONVENTIONAL HIGH SCHOOLS ON SUBSET 5 OF WENOKOR'S ROLE EXPECTATIONS INSTRUMENT — TEACHERS' ROLE EXPECTATIONS

Scale #5 Items	Item Dimension	3 Sch. Cat.	Group Mean Response	Anal. of Variance All 3 School Categories Combined F-Value	Signif.	t - Tests of Uncorrelated Group Means Conventional vs Mini-Sch. t	Sig.	Conventional vs. Indep. Alt. t	Sig.	Mini-Schools vs. Indep. Alt. t	Sig.
Subset #5	Teacher's Obligations (Expectat.) to:										
# 33	Work with the community	Conv. Mini. Indep.	2.3785 2.1923 2.3770	1.5874	nsd.	1.7941	nsd.	0.0160	nsd.	1.3269	nsd.
# 34	Involve students in decision-making	Conv. Mini. Indep.	2.5562 1.8077 2.0656	19.2643	.01	5.3104	.01	3.7314	.01	1.6532	nsd.
# 35	Teacher colleague input to improve competency	Conv. Mini. Indep.	1.8704 2.0385 2.0169	2.0049	nsd.	1.5718	nsd.	1.4995	nsd.	0.1383	nsd.
# 36	Help students improve their basic skills	Conv. Mini. Indep.	1.2910 1.2692 1.2333	0.2722	nsd.	0.2549	nsd.	0.7192	nsd.	0.3361	nsd.
# 37	Promote students' self-image	Conv. Mini. Indep.	1.4817 1.2500 1.3559	3.7882	.05	2.5438	.05	1.4258	nsd.	0.9050	nsd.
# 38	Aid students' work organization and structuring	Conv. Mini. Indep.	1.4242 1.5385 1.3500	1.6050	nsd.	1.3614	nsd.	0.9765	nsd.	1.6797	nsd.
# 39	Aid students in exploring feelings	Conv. Mini. Indep.	2.0678 1.6923 1.5667	10.3172	.01	2.6955	.01	3.8773	.01	0.8993	nsd.

NOTES:

Code:
Conv. = Conventional HS
Mini. = Mini-Sch. Altern.
Indep.= Independ. Altern.HS

Sample Sizes (No. of Cases)
Conv. 354-356
Mini. 52± 0
Indep. 59- 61
Total 465-469

Tabular Values of Levels of Signif.:
F > .05 = 3.02
F > .01 = 4.66
nsd = no signif. diff.

Tabular Values of Levels of Significance:
t > .05 = 1.960
t > .01 = 2.576
nsd = no significant difference, statistically speaking.

Interpretation of Group Mean Scale Values: (See statement in Notes to Table 2 , page 10.)

Four items so analyzed in Table 3 generated no significant statistical differences between types of school faculty subgroups, either alternative or conventional -- including the item on teachers helping students with basic skills which was the most strongly positive generating item on the instrument. In short, positive response generating items were not necessarily discriminating among different kinds of school faculties.

On the other hand, three (3) items dealing with teacher expectations regarding student power in decision-making, with exploring students' feelings, and with promoting students' self-image showed statistically significant differences among faculty groups in the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). In pinpointing which kinds of alternative schools featured these significant differences, the "t" test of uncorrelated group means showed that the mini-school faculties led in positivity toward favoring student power in decision-making and in promoting students' self-image (with no significant differences on the latter between regular and Independent Alternative high school faculties). Independent Alternative led mini-school alternative faculties slightly in positivity toward exploring students' feelings with both these faculty groups statistically significantly ahead of conventional high school faculties at the .01 probability level.

Table 4 analyzed separately the disparate dimensions of teachers' degree of aspiration toward future administrative jobs for themselves; toward greater activity in professional organizations; and toward greater personal recognition from students, fellow teachers, administration, community and parents.

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 4
(See page 14)

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 4

STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ALTERNATIVE AND CONVENTIONAL HIGH SCHOOLS ON SUBSET 9 OF S. WENOKOR'S ROLE EXPECTATIONS INSTRUMENT — TEACHERS' ASPIRATIONS

Scale # 9 (Subset) Items	Item Dimension: Teacher's Degree of Aspiration to:	3 Sch. Cat.	Group Mean Response	Anal. of Variance: All 3 School Categories Combined F-Value	Signif.	t - Tests of Uncorrelated Group Means: Conventional vs.Mini-Sch. t	Sig.	Conventional vs.Indep.Alt. t	Sig.	Mini-Schools vs.Indep.Alt. t	Sig.
# 48	Obtain a chairman's or ass't. prin's. job	Conv. Mini. Indep.	3.2028 2.9808 3.1333	0.4988	nsd.	0.9762	nsd.	0.3222	nsd.	0.5619	nsd.
# 49	Obtain a principal's job	Conv. Mini Indep.	4.1124 3.5962 3.7167	5.5113	.01	2.7396	.01	2.2599	.05	0.4781	nsd.
# 50	Take an important role in profess'nl organizations	Conv. Mini. Indep.	3.1076 3.4423 3.3333	1.8535	nsd.	1.6709	nsd.	1.1753	nsd.	0.4375	nsd.
# 51	Establish good relations with school colleagues	Conv. Mini. Indep.	1.5127 1.6667 1.7544	2.9135	nsd.	1.3934	nsd.	2.1553	.05	0.5116	nsd.
# 52	Receive more recognition from students	Conv. Mini. Indep.	2.1530 2.6346 2.3333	4.6932	.01	2.9656	.01	1.1549	nsd.	1.4436	nsd.
# 53	Receive more recognition from parents	Conv. Mini. Indep.	2.4274 2.9038 2.8929	7.0068	.01	2.7830	.01	2.8461	.01	0.0504	nsd.
# 54	Receive more recognition from c o m m u n i t y	Conv. Mini. Indep.	2.6402 2.9231 3.1607	6.0630	.01	1.6812	nsd.	3.2361	.01	1.1634	nsd.
# 55	Receive more recognition from principal	Conv. Mini. Indep.	2.1977 2.6667 2.3929	4.4818	.05	2.8705	.01	1.2624	nsd.	1.2135	nsd.

NOTES:

Code:
Conv. = Conventional HS
Mini. = Mini-Sch. Altern.
Indep. = Independ. Altern.HS

Sample Sizes (No. of Cases)
Conv. 349-356
Mini. 51- 52
Indep. 56- 60
Total 456-468

Tabular Values of Levels of Signif.:
F > .05 = 3.02
F > .01 = 4.66
nsd = no statis. signif. diff.

Tabular Values of Levels of Significance:
t > .05 = 1.960
t > .01 = 2.576
nsd. = no statistically significant difference

Interpretation of Group Mean Scale Values: (See statement in Notes to Table 2 , page 10.)

Items dealing with greater personal recognition on Table 4, and in obtaining the top administrative job (that of school principal) showed statistically significant differences between conventional and alternative high school faculties. However, the "t" values were negative, because in each of these analyses it was the conventional high school faculty group that indicated greater positivity to the aspiration for greater recognition. Presumably regular high school faculties were less comfortable with the status quo in recognition factors; whereas in the alternative schools, the teachers' groups were presumably more comfortable with the recognition they were already receiving so that their group mean scores approached the neutral 3.000 value, and thus were statistically significantly different from their conventional high school colleagues.

Another noteworthy point was that on the aspiration toward the job of high school principal -- it was seen as a strongly negative value among all faculty groups even though statistically significant differences occurred between conventional high school faculties and those of each of the two kinds of alternative schools. In short, few of the respondent teachers really aspired to the principal's job which was seen by far most negatively among regular high school faculties.

Another negatively rated item was the aspiration to take an important role in professional organizations with the alternative school faculties considerably more strongly negative than conventional faculties on this factor. However, statistically significant differences between alternative and conventional teacher groups was not obtained among these negative uncorrelated group mean scores.

Quite the opposite rating was found in the perceived immediacy of establishing good relations with teacher colleagues, seen as a strongly positive value among both alternative and regular high school faculty groups.

Table 5 on two-factor comparisons (Subset #3) showed that the Independent Alternative high school faculties valued students' academic achievement most highly in contrast with the mini-school faculties which ranked this factor in second (2nd) place, and in greatest contrast with the conventional high school faculties which downgraded this factor to third (3rd) rank.

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 5
(See page 17)

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

Interestingly enough, the factor of Classroom Control and Discipline was ranked in a middle position of importance by the Independent Alternative faculties on Table 5; whereas it took first rank in importance among both mini-school and regular high school faculties.

Staff Relations took 4th and last rank as the factor of least importance among all three school faculty groupings, and constituted the only factor on which group opinion was consensual throughout.

As sets of binary factor comparisons with rank ordering performed, statistical significance was not analyzed for by standard power tests, and all figures appearing in Table 5 have been given as percentage listings.

The "not sure" category was chosen most by mini-school teachers (about 1/3rd of the time), and least frequently by Independent Alternative teachers (who were uncertain only about 1/4th of the time).

Table 5

TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL'S EVALUATION CRITERIA

By Percentage (%) Comparisons

Sub-set # 3 (Items)	Two - Factor Comparisons (1st vs. 2nd)	Total Group 1st Factor	Total Group 2nd Factor	Total Group Not Sure	Conventional HS 1st Factor	Conventional HS 2nd Factor	Conventional HS Not Sure	Mini-School Alt. 1st Factor	Mini-School Alt. 2nd Factor	Mini-School Alt. Not Sure	Indep.Altern. HS 1st Factor	Indep.Altern. HS 2nd Factor	Indep.Altern. HS Not Sure
# 19	Teaching Methods vs. Staff Relations	54.1	22.7	23.2	54.5	22.9	22.6	54.5	20.0	25.5	50.9	24.6	24.6
# 20	Teaching Methods vs. Stud. Acad. Achvm't.	36.3	34.8	28.9	38.3	32.3	29.3	29.1	36.4	34.5	31.6	47.4	21.1
# 21	Teaching Methods vs. Clssrm.Contr.& Discpl.	27.3	45.0	27.8	26.7	46.3	27.0	21.4	44.6	33.9	37.0	37.0	25.9
# 22	Stud. Acad. Achvm't. vs. Staff Relations	50.0	22.8	27.2	50.7	22.7	26.6	46.4	19.6	33.9	49.1	26.3	24.6
# 23	Stud. Acad. Achvm't. vs. Clssrm.Contr.& Discpl.	33.8	36.5	29.7	32.2	37.7	30.1	32.1	35.7	32.1	44.6	30.4	25.0
# 24	Staff Relations vs. Clssrm.Contr.& Discpl.	16.2	55.0	28.8	15.2	56.1	28.7	12.7	58.2	29.1	25.9	44.4	29.6

DATA & ABBREV. Code:

CCD = Classroom Control & Discipline

TM = Teaching Methods

SAA = Students' Academic Achievement

SR = Staff Relations

SAMPLE SIZES (No. of Cases)

	Mean No.
Conv. HS	354
Mini-Sch	52
Indep. Altern	59
TOTAL	465

RANK ORDER Conventional HS

Place	Code
1st	CCD
2nd	TM
3rd	SAA
4th	SR

RANK ORDER Mini-School Alt.

Place	Code
1st	CCD
2nd	SAA
3rd	TM
4th	SR

RANK ORDER Indep.Altern.HS

Place	Code
1st	SAA
2nd }	CCD or TM
3rd }	
4th	SR

Interview Data - Teachers and Principals of Alternative High Schools

Table 6 below, presents in descending order of rating frequencies, the most important characteristics of the successful alternative education program high school teacher, as perceived by over 100 of the teachers themselves. And then, it presents the contrasting and conflicting perceptions of these same characteristics from the point of view of the 16 principals or directors of high school alternatives involved in this study.

Table 6

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ALTERNATIVE H. S. TEACHER

	As Perceived by:	
	Teachers Themselves (N>100) (% of Responses)	Principals (N = 16) (% of Responses)
FLEXIBILITY	69.3	37.2
ABILITY TO GET ALONG WITH STUDENTS	23.1	55.8
COMPASSION/PATIENCE/ UNDERSTANDING	- M -[1]	- M -[1]
INNOVATIVENESS	∝ 20.0	∝ 25.0
COMPETENCE IN SUBJECT AREA	6.6	∝ 33.3

[1] Third in importance, both teachers and principals (directors).

Teachers and principals perceived the teachers' role quite differently. Teachers perceived their most important characteristics in alternative settings as: (1) "flexibility," (2) "ability to get along with students," (3) "compassion, patience, understanding," (4) "innovativeness," and (5) "competence in subject area" in that order descending. Principals relegated teachers' "ability to get along...." as of primary importance, and also regarded competence in subject matter about as important as compassion and understanding.

Table 7 below deals with role expectations for the principal in an alternative educational H. S. setting, again as perceived by the same two disparate groups: teachers in alternative H. S. settings, and their 16 principals or directors of Independent Alternative schools.

Table 7

ROLE EXPECTATIONS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE H. S. PRINCIPAL

	As Perceived by:	
	Teachers (N>100) (% of Responses)	Principals Themselves (N = 16) (% of Responses)
"Be Supportive"	50.0	18.6
"Provide Leadership" & "Liaison to School Community"	Data Missing 13.2	43.4 43.4
"Give Autonomy to the Alternative School"	∝ 20.0	∝ 06.2
"Facilitator"	Data Missing	Data Missing

Principals of high schools with mini-school alternatives (including five (5) directors of Independent Alternative schools) did not percieve of their roles as did teachers serving in alternative educational roles under them. Teachers favored a supportive role with the leadership function and the liaison role for the principal downgraded. They would also seek political support from the principal in gaining complete independence for mini-schools from parent H. S. organizations or the Central Board. In sharp contrast, principals did not see their role as commitment to seeking autonomy, or to being supportive to teachers (only one and three respondents respect-

ively chose these two items). They did, however, see themselves principally in the roles of providing educational leadership and serving as liaison to the school community.

Approximately equal small percentages of teachers and principals (directors) selected the downgraded role of "facilitator."

For a more complete discussion of interview data, the dissertation should be consulted (Wenokor, 1976).[1]

* * *

---

[1] Wenokor, Sidney. A Comparative Study of Teacher and Principal Role Expectations in Regular and Alternative Secondary Schools. Loc. cit.

Chapter IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATION

Summary to Role Expectations Study

A 59-item questionnaire, the "Wenokor Instrument" (1975) using a 5-point scale from very positive to very negative values was designed to measure 10-dimensions of teacher role expectations. It was used in a comparative study in eleven (11) regular high schools together with their eleven (11) mini-school alternatives (under the principal's administration), and in five (5) Independent Alternative high schools (each headed by a director, separate from any regular high school administration), totalling 472 teachers in all. Statistical tests of significance by means of computer analysis of differences among these three sets of faculty groups employed an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with F-tests for overall grouping, and separate t-tests of uncorrelated group means to test the significance of differences between any two kinds of school faculty groups. Principals and Directors (sometimes called Headmasters) completed a similar parallel questionnaire, and selected faculty personnel (including all 16 principals and directors together with certain alternative school teachers--numbering more than 100) were interviewed by the developer of the instrument.

Demographic data on the three groups of teaching faculty by percentage computation revealed the Independent Alternative schools had the youngest and most inexperienced staff with the least advanced academic educational credits. Mini-school staffs, on the other hand, greatly resembled the high school faculty group from which individual interviewees revealed they had been derived by self-selection as part of a process of commitment to students not functioning in the regular program of their high schools.

Mini-school teaching faculty by computer analysis showed statistically significantly higher degree of positivity on professional vs. bureaucratic orienta-

tion of staff and on degree of job satisfaction than either conventional or Independent Alternative school staffs.

In the analysis of teacher expectations, mini-school faculty again showed statistically significantly higher degree of positivity in favoring student power in decision-making and in promoting positive students' self-image than conventional school staffs and higher positivity than Independent Alternative school staffs, although not statistically significantly so. Most components of teacher expectations, such as that to help students improve in basic skills, while positive for all faculty groups, showed no statistically significant differences among regular or alternative (S-W-S or I.A.) school staffs.

Analysis of faculty aspirations varied widely with mini-school faculties showing statistically significant differences from regular school faculties in need for receiving more recognition from students, parents and principal; and, Independent Alternative faculties showing statistically significant differences from regular high school faculties in need for receiving more recognition from parents and from community. Few teachers aspired to the principal's job which was universally perceived as a negative value in this study -- so much so by conventional high school faculties as to be significantly different statistically (in the negative direction) from all alternative school faculties. Participating in professional organizations was also seen as a negative value, more so by all alternative faculties than by regular high school faculties, but without statistical significance.

In the two-factor ranking dimensions subset or substudy, Academic Achievement was most highly prized by Independent Alternative faculties; Classroom Control and Discipline was most prized by both mini-school and conventional high school staffs -- a much downgraded factor among staffs at Independent Alternative schools.

Conclusion to Role Expectations Study

In conclusion, Independent Alternative school staffs, both attitudinally and demographically, perceived themselves very differently from mini-school alternative staffs who had self-selected themselves from their older conventional high school parental organizations. On many dimensions, mini-school faculties showed greater positivity and greater statistically significant differences from regular high school staffs than did their Independent Alternative colleagues. The implications of these considerable differences among types of alternative school faculties for the instructional programs is formidable, and should lead to important researchable questions.

Recommendation

It would be highly remiss on the part of the administrations of alternative schools and on the part of the Office of Access Programs of the Board of Education of the City of New York to permit much time to elapse before carrying out further studies using the Wenokor Instrument, or various modifications thereof. At a time when research into the sociology of education is being widely pursued throughout the country, the kind of instrument in use in this study cannot be afforded neglect.

Validation studies should begin with it immediately. At the very least, the Consortium of Independent Alternative High Schools should generalize its use, since feedback information can be of critical potential value in staff improvement.

* * *

Appendix A

THE WENOKOR INSTRUMENT [1]

(1 9 7 5)

Dear Colleague,

Your help is needed in a pioneering study of role expectations of teachers and administrators for the purpose of improving the way a faculty achieves its educational goals. This venture is undertaken with the cooperative support of the research division of the Board of Education of the City of New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, and the principal, headmaster or Director of your school.

The purpose of this study will be looked at in terms of role expectation differences between teachers in regular and alternative secondary schools.

Would you please answer the attached questionnaire and return it as soon as possible? Please do not state your name, but be as frank as possible in responding to the statements. There are no right or wrong answers. The data gathered will remain absolutely anonymous. The study is not concerned with the evaluation of individuals or schools, but is an attempt to gather data that will tell us more about secondary school teachers today. The questionnaire will take approximately twenty (20) minutes of your time.

Sincerely,

S. W.

---

[1] Developed by Sidney Wenokor in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at the Department of Curriculum & Teaching, Teachers College, Columbia University with the editorial assistance of the Office of Educational Evaluation of the Board of Education of the City of New York, and undertaken as a researchable project, utilizing the Cooperative Research function of the Office of Educational Evaluation, Spring 1975.

SOURCES FOR ITEMS USED IN THE WENOKOR INSTRUMENT AS RELATED TO THE STUDY OF ROLE EXPECTATIONS OF REGULAR AND ALTERNATIVE SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Subset & Items	Dimensions Measured	Source Instruments
S # 1: It. 1 - 10	Professional-Bureaucratic orientation of staff	Corwin, Ronald G. Professional and Bureaucratic Employee Role Orientation Scales. ca. 1960 U.S.O.E. Project.
S # 2: It.11 - 18	Task Organization of teachers' roles	Lortie, Dan. "Control and Autonomy in Elementary Teaching." In: Etzioni, A. The Semi-Professionals and Their Organization. New York: The Free Press, 1969.
S # 3: It.19 - 24	Teacher's Perception of principal's evaluative criteria	Samuels, Johanna Jenny. Bureaucratization of School Districts and Teacher Autonomy. Unpubl. doctoral dissertation: Univ. of California at Los Angeles, 1966.
S # 4: It. 25 - 32	Internal/External criteria of occupational satisfaction	Samuels, Johanna Jenny. Op. cit., 1966.
S # 5: It. 33 - 39	Teacher's role expectations	Gross, N., Mason, W. S. and McEachern, A. W. Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958.
S # 6: It. 40 - 45	Teacher's Perception of his school's organizational characteristics	Robinson, N. A Study of the Professional Role Orientations of Teachers and Principals and their Relationship to Bureaucratic Characteristics of School Organization. Unpubl. doctoral dissertation: University of Alberta, 1966.
S # 7: It. 46.	Degree of job satisfaction	Samuels, Johanna Jenny. Op. cit., 1966.
S # 8: It. 47.	Reaction to supervision	Samuels, Johanna Jenny. Op. cit., 1966.
S # 9: It. 48 - 55	Teacher's Level of Aspiration to career advancement, professionalism and recognition	Gross, N. et al. Opus cited, 1958.
S # 10: It. 56 - 59	Attitude toward teaching as career	Gross, N. et al. Opus cited, 1958.

isted below are ten (10) questions regarding teacher expectations. ou are being asked to respond to each statement on the basis of what ou believe should be rather than what is. Please check the appropriate ox.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
. Teachers should be able to make their own decisions about problems that come up in the classroom.					
. To prevent confusion and friction there should be a rule covering almost every problem that might come up at school.					
. It should be permissible for a teacher to violate a rule if he is sure that the best interests of the students will be served in doing so.					
. One primary criterion of a good school should be the degree of respect that it commands from other teachers in the system.					
. In case of doubt about whether a particular practice is better than another, the primary test should be what seems best for the overall reputation of the school.					
. The school should have a manual of rules and regulations which are actually followed.					
. No matter how special a student's or parent's problem appears to be, the person should be treated in the same way as anyone else.					
. A good teacher should not do anything that he believes may jeopardize the interests of his students regardless of who tells him to, or what the rules state.					

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
9. The school administration <u>should</u> be better qualified than the teacher to judge what is best for education.					
0. Teachers <u>should be</u> active members of professional teacher organizations, and regularly attend conferences and meetings of at least one of these organizations.					

ubset # 2:
f you were to receive a gift on ten hours or more a week, but with the rovision that it be spent on work, how important would each of the ollowing activities be to you in making a choice of how to spend the xtra ten hours?

	Very Important	Important	Not Sure	Not So Important	Unimportan
1. Service on a school or department curriculum committee.					
2. Preparing lessons, reading, studying, and reviewing student work.					
3. Improving the community's assessment of the school by working on exhibits, fairs, parent meetings, etc.					
4. Teaching students either in groups or in individual conferences.					
5. Improving school operations by working on scheduling and programming.					
6. Discussing student work and problems with parents.					
7. Counseling individual students on problems they consider important.					
8. Making school a better place by working on school discipline and safety.					

set # 3:

luating teacher's performance involves various factors. Each item ow contrast two factors. Answer each item by checking which of the factors you think is more important to <u>your principal</u> in his/her luation of teachers.

PRINCIPAL'S EVALUATION OF TEACHERS IS BASED:

	First Factor	Second Factor	Not Sure
. More on their teaching methods than on their staff relations.			
. More on their teaching methods than on the academic achievement of their students.			
. More on their teaching methods than on their classroom control and discipline.			
. More on their student's academic achievement than on their staff relations.			
. More on their student's academic achievement than on their classroom control and discipline.			
. More on their staff relations than on their classroom control and discipline.			

bset # 4:

e following are things that people often think about when they are nsidering an occupation. Put a check in the column to the right rate how important each would be in making an occupation "as satisfying possible" <u>for you.</u>

	Very Important	Important	Not Sure	Not So Important	Unimportant
. Occupational security					
. Leisure time that the occupation affords.					
. Opportunity to use my skills and abilities.					

	Very Important	Important	Not Sure	Not So Important	Unimportant
. Congenial colleagues					
. Opportunity to be original and innovative					
. Opportunity for advancement					
. Opportunity to work with young people					
. A good package of health and pension benefits					

bset # 5:

A TEACHER, WHAT OBLIGATIONS DO YOU VE TO DO OR NOT TO DO THE FOLLOWING INGS:	Absolutely Must	Preferably Should	May or May Not	Preferably Should Not	Absolut Must No
. Work with the community in developing a better school.					
. Involve students in deciding on matters related to curriculum, grading, class rules, etc.					
. Work with other teachers to improve your competence as a teacher.					
. Help students improve in the basic skills.					
. Be concerned with a student's self image.					
. Help students to organize and structure their work.					
. Involve yourself in helping students to explore their feelings.					

Subset # 6:

In this section you are asked to indicate how well each statement describes the organizational characteristics of your school.

	Always True	Often True	Occasionally True	Seldom True	Never True
40. The use of a wide variety of teaching methods and materials is encouraged in this school.					
41. Staff members are allowed to do almost as they please in their classroom work.					
42. Teachers develop warm personal relationships with students.					
43. A person who wants to make his own decisions would quickly become discouraged in this school.					
44. In dealing with student discipline problems, teachers are encouraged to consider the individual offender, not the offense in deciding on a suitable punishment.					
45. Rules and regulations in this school are consistent.					

46. To what extent is teaching in your school a satisfying experience?

SUBSET # 7:

( ) Very satisfying for me.

( ) Satisfying for me.

( ) Not satisfying for me.

( ) Very unsatisfying for me.

( ) Undecided.

47. Freedom from supervision is important to me in a job that is "as satisfying as possible".

SUBSET # 8:

( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Not sure

Subset # 9:

HOW DESIROUS ARE YOU OF DOING THE FOLLOWING THINGS?	I would very much like to	I have some desire to	I am not sure	I am not especially anxious to	I would not want to
48. Obtain an assistant principal's or chairman's job.					
49. Obtain a principal's job.					
50. Take an important role in professional organizations.					
51. Establish good relations with school colleagues.					
52. Receive more recognition for my work from students.					
53. Receive more recognition for my work from parents.					
54. Receive more recognition for my work from the community.					
55. Receive more recognition for my work from my principal.					

In answering the following questions please consider TEACHING AS A CAREER rather than your present job.

SUBSET # 10:

56. How much does teaching give you a chance to do the things which you can do best?

( ) A very good chance

( ) A fairly good chance

( ) Some chance

( ) Very little

( ) Not sure

57. How does teaching compare with other kinds of work?

( ) It is the most satisfying career a person could follow.

( ) It is one of the most satisfying careers.

( ) It is as satisfying as most careers.

( ) It is less satisfying than most careers.

( ) Undecided

58. If you "had to do it over again" would you enter the field of teaching?

( ) Definitely yes

( ) Probably yes

( ) Probably no

( ) Definitely no

( ) Undecided

59. Has teaching lived up to the expectations you had before you entered it?

( ) Yes, in all respects

( ) In most ways

( ) In only a few ways

( ) Not at all

( ) Undecided

PLEASE CONTINUE TO THE NEXT PAGE

PERSONAL DATA

(Please do not indicate your name)

60. SEX: Male_____ ; Female_____

61. AGE: 21-30____;31-40____;41-50____;51-60____; Over 60____

62. MARITAL STATUS: Single_____; Married_____; Other_____

63. NUMBER OF YEARS IN TEACHING_____

64. NUMBER OF YEARS IN THIS SCHOOL _____

65. EDUCATION: B.A.____;B.A. + 30 credits;B.A.+ 60 credits;
B.A. + more than 60 credits _____

66. Subject Department_____

For alternate school teachers only.

67. NUMBER OF YEARS IN ALTERNATE SCHOOL_____

68. Did you volunteer to come to this alternate school?

( ) Yes ( ) No

69. If you did volunteer, state briefly the three (3) most important reasons.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix B

HIGH SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONS IN THE STAFF ROLE EXPECTATIONS STUDY

Independent Alternative High Schools	Conventional High Schools—Each with a Mini-School Organization as Alternative School-within-a-School Attached	
Urban School Organizations	**Urban School Organizations**	
Pacific Alternative H. S.	H. Lehman H.S.	BX
City - as - School	Morris H.S.	BX
P. M. High School	C. E. Hughes H.S.	M
Lower East Side Prep.	J. Madison H.S.	BK
Satellite Academies	J. Bowne H.S.	Q
	A. Jackson H.S.	Q
	Bayside H.S.	Q
	Springfld Gardens H.S.	Q
Subtotal - 5	Subtotals - 8	+ 8 Mini-Schools
	Suburban School Organizations	
	Gr. Neck - North	Great Neck, L.I.
	Gr. Neck - South	Great Neck, L.I.
	Wheatley H.S.	Old Westbury-E. Williston, L.I.
	Subtotals - 3	+ 3 Mini-Schools
Total: - 5 Indep. Altern. H.S.	Total: - 11 Conventional H.S.	+ 11 Mini-Schools